Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. V, NO. 33, *Issue Number* 238, AUGUST 18, 1948 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED AUG 24 1948 LIBRARY

WHY NO PEACE WITH JAPAN?

by Kiyoshi K. Kawakami

President Truman announced the surrender of Japan on August 14, 1945. At that time few would have suggested that three years later there would still be no treaty of peace between the United States and this defeated enemy.

Well over a year ago, in May, 1947, General Douglas MacArthur publicly stated that his mission as Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers was practically completed and that Japan was ready for peace. Much the same view was then expressed by high officials of the State Department. Now all this is forgotten, and responsible Americans here and in Tokyo fight shy of the problem of peace with Japan. Why this change?

The answer is not far to seek. To put it bluntly, the military high command is fearful that the cold war with Soviet Russia may suddenly turn "hot" and that the time may come when the United States may have to use Japan as its first line of defense across the Pacific.

In HUMAN EVENTS for May 5, 1948, I described Korea as a potential Soviet springboard directed against Japan. But Korea is not the only Red springboard so directed. Thanks to American generosity, or shortsightedness, at Yalta and Potsdam, Russia obtained Saghalien, the Kurile Islands and practical control of Manchuria -- all excellent jumping-off points from Siberia to Japan. Thus Japan is effectively flanked by Russia on the North and West.

To offset the strategical consequences of these territorial concessions, the United States now finds itself confronted with the necessity of using Japan as a base of operation or counteroffensive against Russia in the event of war. Japan itself has become a potential American springboard directed against Russia.

This, as I see it, is the real reason why the Administration has changed its mind about peace with Japan. For peace might require not merely the withdrawal of American troops but also demolition of the great air bases built by the army of occupation in various parts of Japan. It could also require the obliteration of the Japanese naval bases and navy yards, which strangely remained unscathed through the war.

Copyright 1948 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Few Americans have stopped to reflect why Hiroshima was wiped out by an atomic bomb while the great naval base of Kure nearby was not molested -- or why Nagasaki was similarly blasted while another great naval base, Sasebo, not far from the razed city, was never attacked -- or why the naval base of Yokosuka went immune from all aerial assaults while the neighboring city of the same name was almost destroyed.

The demolition of these naval bases in the middle stages of the Pacific War might have broken Japanese morale almost as effectively as the atomic pulverization of Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the eleventh hour, when Japan had all but decided to surrender. More important, the bombing of the naval bases would have been legitimate, both morally and militarily. Hiroshima, on the contrary, has troubled many Americans.

Is it possible that even in those early days, when President Roosevelt was bent upon appeasing Stalin, American strategists envisaged the time when they might have to use those Japanese bases against the very nation their Commander in Chief was trying so hard to please? Certainly, with world peace trembling in the balance, those bases today loom very important in American military eyes.

As for the American air bases in Japan, they cannot be maintained after peace on the pretense that they are commercial, for most of them are located at strategic points which have no relation to commercial needs. Incidentally, these and other American military installations have consumed much of Japan's critical, scarce materials, sorely needed for normal industrial purposes.

In accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, Japan has been effectively disarmed. Furthermore, under the new Constitution, Japanese governments are pledged to permanent disarmament and eternal renunciation of war. There will be no harm now in divulging, what everybody privately concedes, that this pacifist Constitution was practically ordained by General MacArthur's headquarters; it was a gift of the American Government to the Japanese people.

As a corollary to the pacifism thus enunciated Washington should, before this, have given a lead to other capitals by proclaiming Japan permanently neutral and inviolable in the event of war between its neighbors. Indeed, the United States should never have built those strategic air bases in Japan. If America is true to the idealism its officials have been preaching to the Japanese, then America should voluntarily destroy those bases as a step towards the peace with Japan which is now long overdue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be argued, and with reason, that Japan's neutrality would not be respected by Russia any more than Belgian neutrality was, in two wars, respected by Germany. But there is a measure of difference between an armed Belgium and a disarmed Japan. Should Russia invade a defenseless Japan, neutralized under American leadership, both Toyko and Washington would be in a strong moral position, and Moscow would stand convicted at the bar of free public opinion. Moral principles and the power of idealism are not entirely dead, even in this post-war period when the Atlantic Charter is mocked, and the "Four Freedoms" cast to the four winds.

On the other hand, the presence of American armaments in Japan is a virtual invitation to Russia to attack that country the moment the cold war ceases to be cold. In the end the armed protection of the United States may prove more disastrous to Japan than absolute absence of military defense. An undefended Japan could teach Russia the Tolstoian doctrine of non-resistance.

Japan under occupation is not the mistress of its own destiny. If requested by President and Senate, the Japanese Government would doubtless sign a treaty entrusting its defense to the military might of the United States. And there is a not inconsiderable number of Japanese -- ex-soldiers, ultranationalists, dissolved and purged Zaibatsu -- who see their country's and their own resurgence in Japan's fighting on the winning -- that is the American -- side, in the event of war between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R.

But such reactionaries are a small minority. Most Japanese are now ardently for peace and neutrality. Which type of Japanese thinking should America encourage? The question is no sooner asked than answered.

It seems evident that if America's associates in the Pacific War were convinced of the genuineness of American idealism, they would gladly join hands with Washington in calling a peace conference for Japan without further delay. Soviet Russia, which fought Japan for five days, would be the only exception.

Japan's other neighbors, particularly China and the Philippines, seem to suspect that the United States cherishes a secret desire to rebuild Japan as a military nation with a view to making it a bulwark against Russia. Of late, Shanghai, Nanking and Peking have been the scenes of anti-American demonstrations staged by students and professors who declared that America, making hay under the sun of occupation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is deliberately delaying peace with Japan. In the past, demonstrations of this nature have sometimes been inspired by Chinese officials for political effect abroad.

IV

But reparations constitute the major problem on which the Allied Nations must agree, at least in principle, before the meeting of a full peace conference. Russia has been demanding 15 per cent of reparations, to be taken from Japan proper. This is in addition to all the valuable Japanese industrial installations which the Soviet has already removed from Manchuria and North Korea.

Naturally, the other Allied Nations insist that Moscow, having already taken more than it is entitled to, has no right to any further claim. To attain its objectives, the U. S. S. R., with the usual veto power, insists that major peace terms be settled by a Big Four conference, consisting of the United States, Britain, China and itself -- the terms thus settled to be presented to a general conference of all the Allied Nations as a fait accompli.

The United States has shown little interest in claiming reparations for itself. This is more altruistic than diplomatic. The United States made by far the greatest sacrifices and played the most important role in the subjugation of Japan. Therefore it is entitled to and should claim the lion's share in reparations from Japan. The American Government need not actually take what it claims, but the claim would place Washington in a strong bargaining position in dealing with other claimants demanding more than seems equitable or fair.

The solution of the reparation problem is prerequisite to all plans for Japan's economic recovery and reconstruction. In the words of the latest official American committee which has studied the Japanese situation on the spot:

> "The Japanese do not know which plants and which equipment will be left to them, so, within industries thought to be subject to reparations, incentive to restore and reconstruct is suppressed. Plants which are needed to bring about the recovery of Japan should be retained and only excess capacity removed. Otherwise the United States, which is now extending relief to Japan, would in reality be paying the reparations bill."

Three years after surrender Japan is entitled to ask for peace. And with peace, Japan could become the springboard to the Asiatic continent, not for the armed might of America, but for the political principles handed down by the founding fathers of the Republic.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events August 18, 1948

By Frank C. Hanighen

The Special Session dispelled one hideous phantom conjured by Democratic publicity typewriters -- an open split between the GOP Congress and candidate Dewey. Now that the Republican Party has emerged more united than ever from the Session, some Washington scribes have taken to a new line of speculation. They peer into the distant future and perceive an inevitable split between Dewey as President and a "reactionary" Congress, as soon as the new Administration takes over. Such forebodings, however, seem exaggerated for a number of reasons.

For one thing, journalists these August days turn their backs on the deserted Capitol Hill and visit around downtown, where most of the officials consulted are naturally Administration supporters. The latter are very obliging with material discouraging to Republicans. Also, writers in an effort to be fair try to "balance" the present lopsided political picture; this is very often a sound approach, and, in any case, is an old journalistic custom. Finally, some are already, for reasons of self-interest, seeking to encourage the creation of a bloc of GOP rebels in Congress. These reporters will no longer enjoy the information sources they had during the New Deal; and a "liberal" group on the Hill would presumably supply them with the kind of news they want.

Those who try to appraise the future objectively find much reason to assume that at the outset, at least, harmony should reign between the GOP Executive and Legislative majority. It would be folly to deny that a split between the two could never occur. It seems reasonable, however, to allow for an initial "honeymoon". Moreover, if Taft could co-operate with Vandenberg, why should he not get along with Dewey? One GOP Senator, a friend of the Ohioan, remarked to us last week: "Taft will go all the way to co-operate with Dewey." As a matter of fact, the Senate Majority Policy Committee (forum of differences) had much less trouble reconciling so-called "liberals" and so-called "standpatters" than is supposed. Its bitterest conflict, indeed, arose from the attitude of the military-minded Senator Gurney, not from the "liberals".

* * * * *

This is the history (to date) of a trial balloon. It was readied when White House advisers perceived that the spy probe was hurting Truman and that the GOP had successfully taken the offensive away from the Democrats. How to get it back -- was the subject of much discussion in the Administration. Soon the argument was made: to get at the "truth" of the spy matter, a nonpartisan commission of inquiry was needed -- a body like the Royal Commission which delved into the same matter in Canada. Then the balloon was set afloat in Washington's rarefied atmosphere. Editorials were inspired in the press, columnists provided with subject matter for some high-minded stuff. It was overlooked that there is no institution in this country enjoying the respect and authority of an ad hoc Royal Commission. Under our system primary reliance has always been placed on the Congressional inquiry. Moreover, during the past 16 years, the Executive has subverted the alternative procedure of a politically impartial investigation which had commenced to command much respect under the Hoover regime (for instance, the Wickersham Commission).

But Senator Ferguson sighted the inflated object on August 12 and unlimbered his machine-gun. He expressed the doubt that any eminent man would care to lend his name to what he described as an expedition designed at least to delay judgment until after the election, if not to whitewash it. Senator Milliken joined Ferguson by

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ridiculing it from a legal standpoint. Milliken said that such a commission could not operate without a grant of authority from Congress. All evidence, he said, shows that the Executive has no power to subpoena witnesses, take oaths, invoke perjury charges or cite for contempt. When the Roberts Commission to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster was formed late in December 1941, the Executive had to seek powers from Congress. Judge Hatton Sumners, a recognized expert on Constitutional questions in the House, remarked that if the Roberts Commission was to function effectively, it had to receive such powers from Congress. Senator Milliken described the dilemma: either the President would have to summon Congress back into Special Session to grant such powers; or an Executive-appointed commission would be powerless to conduct any real inquiry. At this point, former attorney Clark Clifford is reportedly pondering such considerations. The balloon, meanwhile, has disappeared.

* * * * *

We talked the other day to a prominent Democratic politico who had just visited the President. He told us that just before he entered the Presidential office one of the White House aides urged him to "try to buck him up". After talking to Mr. Truman, the politico allowed that the President did need "bucking up". It is believed that one of the causes of the Presidential despondency is his growing realization that the South will not "have to vote for him". For many months, White House advisers have been telling the President that "the Southern states will have to support you, they have nowhere else to go".

This assurance now looks rather threadbare. Political observers are now eating their words, admitting that they had underestimated the chances of the Dixiecrat movement. The fact is that today the Dixiecrats have the 28 electoral votes of three states -- Mississippi, Alabama and South Carolina. They are waging promising battles for control of Texas, Georgia and Arkansas. And their influence in Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee may make it impossible for the Truman Democrats to win in multi-party contests.

One development in the past few days suggests that the Dixiecrat movement may have a wider scope than originally supposed. The Dixiecrats are considering a move to place their Party on the ballot in Minnesota. Indeed, there is no valid reason why they should not seek support outside the South. Due to some shrewd thinking by their leader, Governor Thurmond, they made their main principle state's rights, not white supremacy. This should give them a favorable entree into many Northern states where state or regional interests might provide vote-getting issues. It will be interesting to see if they really try to take advantage of such situations. In any case, the Dixiecrats seem to be going places.

* * * * *

Once upon a time, there existed a school of liberal journalism in this country, and its courageous exponents included such individuals as Oswald Garrison Villard, Ray Stannard Baker, Ida Tarbell, George Creel, Lincoln Steffens, not to mention many others. These writers thoroughly exposed the forces of corruption and reaction throughout the land. It was not noticeable that they ever had any inhibitions as to whether their journalistic revelations would embarrass the public officials in the cities and states where they did their muckraking. "Let the people hear the truth", was the motto. Today, however, what is called -- or often self-styled -- "liberal journalism" has a different and rather confused code.

For example -- behold the "liberal" Washington Post in its issue of August 13. Real liberal journalism holds sway on page 3, where, as part of a serial, Igor Gouzenko, the former code clerk of the Soviet Embassy in Canada, relates how that Embassy had information from "an American who holds a high post in the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States Government", and who was also "in a position to influence questions of national political importance". Now one would think that the Post which sponsored such a revelation would seek to assist all attempts to unmask Americans guilty of such treasonable activities; would even go further and demand that Gouzenko be subpoenaed forthwith by the House Committee to identify the accused. On the contrary. On the editorial page of the same issue, the Post assails the House Committee because it did not leave the inquiries to the "regular law enforcement agencies". It is difficult to imagine Lincoln Steffens adopting such an attitude of forebearance towards the police and district attorneys of the cities and states where he engaged in his journalistic labors. It is difficult, indeed, to see how the Post qualifies for its reputation as a "liberal" journal.

* * * * *

The blockade of Berlin gradually constricts, and the air lift gradually swells -- with varying effects on the morale of official circles in Washington. Some of those in authority here become depressed at every Russian move to tighten the iron ring around Berlin; others take new hope at every increase in deliveries to the Tempelhof airfield. The difference in attitudes appears strikingly, on the one hand, in the Army and, on the other, in the Air Forces. Those in a position to hear the arguments of both sides give the following summary.

The Army claims that since the beginning of the siege, we have succeeded in supplying the following percentages of Berlin's needs: food -- 56 per cent; fuel -- 14 per cent. Early in August, it was estimated that the following level of supplies prevails in Berlin: food -- 35 days; fuel -- 17 days. These are not reassuring statistics. The current nightmare is about telephone and telegraph communications; it is feared that the Russians will cut off these land lines, thereby complicating our problems. Few in the Ground Forces here entertain any hope for ultimate victory; and some even go so far as to make plans for dealing with the Central European situation after an evacuation of Berlin, and perhaps of Vienna, too.

The views emerging from the Air Force make pleasanter reading. New estimates have reduced the tonnage believed necessary to keep Berlin going. It is emphasized that we have not yet exerted our full transport capacity. There are still large reserves of transport planes in this country and the Pacific which could be thrown into the breach. Meanwhile, ground facilities in Germany have been improved and technical staff augmented. It is now felt that another landing strip at Tempelhof will be unnecessary. Indeed, some Air Force circles now claim that minimum needs in Berlin can be maintained throughout the winter -- although it is conceded that this would involve much suffering among the population.

The variance in the above views explains much of the confusion in the popular mind in this country about the chances of holding Berlin. Those who attempt to follow developments in the press should be advised that some commentators and reporters reflect Ground Force views, others those of the Air Force. Both attitudes are subject to some correctives. The Air Force, a new service, is inclined to be over-optimistic about its capabilities; also it has much less to lose if disaster should come to Central Europe. The Air Force can afford to think of its next line of defense -- the Mediterranean and the United Kingdom. The Ground Forces, on the other hand, tend to see the worst possible contingencies. If the Soviets upset the applecart in Central Europe, it would mean great losses for the Ground Forces -- they would suffer the most. Also, both arms of the service look at the situation too much from the purely military standpoint, neglecting political factors. It should be recalled that the State Department and Central Intelligence, which place more stress on politics, were right in their view last spring -- namely, that Soviet Russia would not start hostilities at that time. And the services were wrong in expecting a Soviet drive westward within a few months.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes and Quotes

The article, "Our Irredeemable Paper Money", by Congressman Howard H. Buffett, has stimulated a very interesting controversy among readers of HUMAN EVENTS and has drawn the largest mail in many a month. Mr. Buffett scrutinizes developments not only in monetary but also in other economic fields. The following is a quotation from a weekly release which he sends to newspapers in his constituency: "The idea of 'planning' has a magic appeal to many people everywhere. Most folks prefer order to disorder, and promoters of plans cleverly associate their schemes with both order and progress. During the war, from Congress on down to Saturday Night Dancing Clubs, almost every organization had committees on post-war plans. Does government planning fulfill its promises? Well, as Al Smith used to say, 'Let's look at the record!' Since V-E Day your government has done a 'whole-hog' job of planning in Germany. Here are some recent items from that record.

"(1) Persons imprisoned for dealings on the black market are given extra rations. Why? The official explanation is that these poor devils, for the time of their imprisonment, are unable to supplement their rations on the black market. If you can make this deal add up, please help me out! (2) To one large town the American planners were able to allot in 1947 a single (one) handkerchief. The mayor, showing both humor and wisdom, delivered the handkerchief to the local museum to be preserved for future generations as a memento of the age of planning. (3) In a Wurttemberg-Baden section of the American Zone, the monthly paper consumption by the bureaucrats runs about 1,000 tons. Newspapers of the area get 32 tons, books get 70 tons, and periodicals get 500 tons. (4) All cash holdings of Germans must be shortly turned in for cancellation. The holders of this cash (German marks) will get some new currency in exchange, but only such amount as their American guardians decide they should individually receive, and NOT necessarily in proportion to the amount they turn in. The foregoing incidents are not an effort to pass judgment on our carpetbag military government in Germany. That organization is probably doing the best it can. The simple truth is that planning is impossible, except by despotism. It ends in poverty and serfdom for all except the 'planners'."

* * * * *

Le Penseur. "Wallace is a strange man to be in contemporary American politics: he thinks. As FDR once put it, he has ideas about some of the world's central problems. He keeps himself informed. He has perspectives. Worse yet, Wallace is utterly independent -- an objective patriot, indifferent to special interests, concerned only with over-all national interests. And those who know him well in spite of his tendency to conceal his abilities and successes are sure that he would make a good and successful President, and are almost certain that someday he will be President of the United States."

The foregoing is from Trends & Tides -- A Paper of Information and Opinion, edited and published at Milford, N. J., by Louis Adamic. Apart from this new light thrown on the Wallace mind, the publication offers additional food for irony. Mr. Adamic, it may be recalled, was named by Mr. Louis Budenz at the Senate Hearings two weeks ago as a publicist whom the Communist Party tried to influence, during the late war. At that time, Mr. Adamic who has exerted considerable sway over Slav opinion in the United States was an enthusiastic admirer of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. In those days, Mr. Adamic had many thoughts on the Yugoslav situation. Today, it is interesting to note that this expert on Yugoslavia has no space nor time for any thoughts in T & T on Marshal Tito's rift with the Cominform. The Wallace Party Convention obviously finessed the Tito question which has caused much controversy among American Slavs. Similarly, Mr. Adamic prefers to concentrate on other, safer subjects -- such as, Wallace the Thinker.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Science and the Modern World, by Alfred North Whitehead. New York: Pelican Mentor Books. 35 cents. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

The reappearance of this work in a popular reprint edition is a matter of some interest, since it is an indication that the influence of Professor Whitehead has begun to trickle from the academic altitudes into larger and perhaps more fertile fields. When the Professor died last December, his rank among the great systematic philosophers was generally acknowledged, but it could hardly be said that his philosophy was as yet generally understood. There were two reasons for this beyond the general distastes for metaphysics in any form. His speculations had carried him in a direction antagonistic to the modes of thought to which his own generation had been habituated; he had also a profound distrust of any philosophic vocabulary which is based on static concepts of meaning, since his was a universe in which nothing stays put. His theory of meaning is set forth in his work on symbolism and his application of the theory in the preparation of Process and Reality resulted in an idiom so formidable that few have ventured to brave it. And in this respect, alas, most of his disciples and expositors, including Miss Dorothy Emmet, have felt obliged to imitate him.

But in Adventures of Ideas, Religion in the Making, and Science in the Modern World Professor Whitehead employed an historical approach, fully consistent with his ultra-evolutionary view, and thereby considerably clarified the problem of his reader. By using these books as a kind of commentary or gloss to Process and Reality, one can make out at least the dim outlines of the system in which he hoped to reconcile not only science and religion but the whole of human experience into what he called "the philosophy of organism". But this task involved nothing less than a synthesis of the universe of Heraclitus and Bergson with that of Plato -- the world of incessant flux and the world of abiding and unchanging realities. This, however, involved a repudiation of the whole notion of "substance". Thus instead of the Aristotelian distinction of form and matter, we have the distinction of "actual entities" and "eternal objects".

The actual entities are in a sense concrete unities, but the concretion is merely one of relationships. That is to say, an actual entity is not a thing, or unity of substance, but an organism, or unity of feelings. And since the relationships of feeling are constantly changing, an actual event is actual only once and is never repeated. At the instant of actualization its unity is modified and out of the modification new unities are formed. Thus the creation is not an historical event but a never-ceasing process. The dynamic agency of creation appears to be a sort of love, or at any rate a sort of emotion to which the whole universe is evidently susceptible. Anyway, it is feeling, or "prehension", which determines the relation of one thing for another and the relationship which determines the reality.

The eternal objects appear to correspond to the Platonic ideas. They are conceived in the mind of God and seem to consist of all the possibilities which can ever be realized in actual occasions. Or to put it in another way, the actual entities represent everything that is or was, the eternal objects represent everything that may be. The eternal objects strive to enter into the actual occasions and to direct the patterns of change. This process is called "ingression" and to the extent that it succeeds God becomes manifest in the universe, and this apparently is determined by our awareness of Him. Whitehead's theology seems to be at once monotheistic and pantheistic. God in His primordial or conceptual nature He is one, but in His concrescent or physical nature He strives to become all.

1323 M STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events August 18, 1948

By Bertrand de Jouvenel

On the anniversary of the start of the First World War the Western envoys in Moscow were at last admitted to the Presence -- after a period of feet-cooling which was, no doubt, intended to induce a suitable frame of mind. The space given by our papers, first to the impish disappearance of Molotov -- and then to the question: "Will they see him or not?" -- culminated in a triumphal splash when he unbent so far as to grant them audience after audience. Could we have proved more conclusively to Moscow our eagerness to begin "the retreat from Berlin"?

At the time of writing we do not know here in what way and to what extent we have "Muniched". Nor need this secrecy surprise us. For if Wilson, as the text-books say, opened the era of open diplomacy, Roosevelt lost no time in closing it.

In Paris it is freely hinted by those unreliable sources which pass for "authoritative" that a bargain is being struck whereby we would exchange a toe hold in Berlin for some Russion supervision of the Ruhr. This suggestion, though hardly credible, may stand as a pointer to Russian wishes. More probably, our contribution is to be a suspension of the London plans for setting up a Western German State -- plans which received but a grudging assent from the eleven German Minister-Presidents.

By the time this article is in print the event will possibly have disproved these rumors, but their mere currency is noteworthy as proving that any settlement in Moscow, whatever its conditions, would be found more welcome than none. The history of ten years ago is being repeated.

"Muniching", in fact, comes as a relief to opinion in Western Europe. We are too shortsighted and too egoistic to be troubled by Eastern Europe's distress. Those who escape from it we receive kindly and absorb easily into our daily life, but we expect them to keep their experiences to themselves. Drama fatigues us. What we ask is comedy.

* * *

A charming movie comedy, which brings to life on the screen a children's story of the late 19th Century, while preserving its naivete and the quaintness of its old-world illustrations, has caused in France a veritable stampede. Here heavily moustachio'd "gendarmes" fall over their feet and their scabbards, as they go in chase of no less clownish "bandits". It is a piece of restful and delightful fooling, but in its very success lies a significance. Western Europe is now laying its ghosts. It is relaxing and starting to enjoy itself in an atmosphere of nascent peace. People take holidays, redecorate their homes, buy washing machines and start up businesses. The climate is favorable to economic revival: how ask at such a time that the people should brace themselves to dangerous trials of strength?

When such is the general temper, the Western Communists have been astute in making military credits the first objective of their attack. To the cry for public economy they answer: "Cut down the army." This is indeed an old and well-tried plank in left wing platforms, but now it accords with the prevailing mood in the various countries -- Britain excepted -- that their several armies could anyhow achieve but little. For confidence in the armed forces to revive, there must first be one European army.

* * *

The advent to power in France of Paul Reynaud has been hailed as that of a man of proved competence, of one who is well above the average French politician in knowledge both of the world and economics. Temperamentally audacious, he is bold

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

March 12). And of course there was the occasion on March 3, last, when Secretary Forrestal summoned twenty-two newspaper, radio, magazine and newsreel executives to Washington and tried to persuade them to censor themselves. Those summoned politely declined.

But perhaps the most disturbing of all was the Administration's attempt, via Hamilton Robinson, a State Department official, and the Security Advisory Board, to set up censorship rules for all the executive agencies. Exposure of this by Nat Finney of the Minneapolis Tribune was a sensation in October, 1947, but unfortunately the subsequent brief House investigation was almost ignored, though not by Ferguson. "I note that Mr. Robinson told the committee", said Finney at the second and final hearing, "that the security standards his board proposes would not cause information to be withheld from Members of Congress. I asked him about that when I first interviewed him and he informed me that if a Member of Congress asked for information he would get it whether it was classified or not. I believe this is true, but I believe it falls a long way from being the whole truth about the effect this scheme would have on Congress. How can you ask for information if the very existence of the information is kept secret? Does any Congressman have the time to run through the so-called confidential files of the departments and find out what is in them? Wouldn't it quickly become the practice of the departments to ask for executive sessions of Congressional committees the minute any classified information became involved in the testimony of an employee of the executive branches? Wouldn't any Congressman who willfully divulged such information, heard in an executive session, be attacked for disclosing secret information?"

* * * * *

Skyrocketing meat prices, with the prospect of additional wage increases, have inspired fears of an inflationary graph of vertical proportions -- with a "bust" at the end. There are, however, some observers in Washington who take a less dramatic view of the situation. These observers do not write for publications of either the Republican or Democratic sects; nor is their gathering of information affected by the desire to "play ball" with the Government sources which provide such information. They are simply economic analysts of such remorseless detachment that they could scarcely get jobs as economic analysts under the Truman Administration. To resume -- they see hope in what (in their strange argot) is referred to as a "divergent price situation".

Specifically, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' statement that the index of wholesale commodity prices has reached a 150-year high point obscures another phenomenon: a striking weakness in tallow, cottonseed oil, cotton, wheat and corn, during the past few months. Non-ferrous metal prices bulge upward; but grain prices droop. What all this "divergency" means is that prices of agricultural supplies are tugging at the coattails of buoyant prices of other commodities. No matter (to the cold-blooded economists) that meat prices dismay the housewife; these are but the result of a temporarily short supply of livestock today. The tight situation in this particular food item should not blind one to the probability that the long inflationary trend in farm and food prices is at last approaching an end. A reversal is due, overdue, and our economic analyst friends are looking for a transition now from the inflationary trend in farm prices to a new long-range deflationary trend. Such a trend would be caused mainly by the enlargement of agricultural supplies. If these analysts are guessing right, farm commodity prices will eventually descend into line with the price level of non-farm commodities. In other words, there is an economic force at work which should offset what superficially looks like an undeterred price rise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prestige and permanence to investigations. It would also remove criticism by so-called "liberal" elements which have consistently hammered the House Committee -- and most unjustly. In this connection, it is noted that these "liberal" elements treated the Ferguson investigation of subversives with respect, while they continued to assail the House Committee which was doing much the same job. This policy was undoubtedly tactical: by criticizing Parnell Thomas' House Committee they maintained their "liberal" status, the while doing what they could to discredit the general probe; and by supporting the Senate Committee they tempered their attitude to the strong wind of public opinion which is shocked by the exposures.

H. L. Mencken, in the Baltimore Sun (August 8), performed a useful job of surgery on the buncombe of "liberals", in his characteristic manner: "A lot has been made of the fact that the committees engaged in smoking out these rascals . . . have occasionally knocked some bark off a presumably innocent man. . . . As for the innocents gored by the committee oxen, I refuse to waste any tears on them. No one holds their misadventure against them, and it seldom does them any harm. Here I speak by the book, for I was myself one of them in the first great Red hunt, following World War I, and stand listed to this day as an agent of Moscow in the celebrated Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling's handbook, The Red Network. I am quite unaware of any damage, either contemporaneously or now. A good many people looked at me askance for a while, but they were all people I was glad to be shet of. . . . there is probably not a single man, woman or child on earth today who believes seriously that I am a guzzler of the Marxian hooch, or ever have been. I have been purged and purified like Shadrack, Meshach and Abednego, and feel no worse for it than they did. Age, unhappily, has rusted my withers, but I am still sassy and complacent, and still disliked by genuine Communists and their stooges."

* * * * *

President Truman could hardly have guessed, when at Philadelphia on July 15 he called the 80th Congress back to Washington, that the final hour of the Special Session would be devoted, not to civil rights or high prices, but to a devastating attack upon himself and his Administration for its long established habit of withholding or suppressing vital information. Quite unexpectedly, on Saturday afternoon, August 7, Senator Ferguson served notice that he would address the Senate. When he finally rose in the chamber at 8 o'clock that night, most people supposed that he would deal with the Remington case. So he did, but Remington served only as a convenient starting point for a long and savage enumeration. The Pearl Harbor investigation, various efforts at censorship, the withholding of information on reciprocal trade, on Atomic Energy Commission appointees, on immigration, etc., received attention. Ferguson wound up his charges by saying that suppression had gone so far that Congress had the ridiculous choice of legislating in the dark or impeaching the President.

The speech crystallized in the minds of many observers a conviction that the all too frequently recurring instances of body hiding on the part of the Administration were part of a pattern. Recollection brought back other examples which provided further illumination. There was the strange case (New York Times, March 6) of Robert Miller of the United Press, who, barred from entering Saudi Arabia, discovered that all American newspapermen were also prohibited, "with the full co-operation, and perhaps at the instigation of the United States Army, State Department and oil company officials". Last December Aviation Week published a story about the supersonic rocket plane, the XS-1, a news job which brought the FBI down on McGraw-Hill. This case had a comical touch. Photographs of the XS-1 were banned at the moment when they were being used on an enlistment poster (New York Herald-Tribune,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED